



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,589	03/30/2001	James T. Dollins	GP-300750 5685	
7590 03/10/2005			EXAMINER	
JEFFREY A. SEDLAR			CHENG, JOE H	
General Motors Corporation Legal Staff Mail Code 482-C23-B21			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. Box 300	. 0000 102 020 221	3713		
Detroit, MI 48265-3000			DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	M	
	V	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/820,589	DOLLINS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joe H. Cheng	3713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	·					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 March 2001</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv	ion No				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-092) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D					

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed structural elements of the "integrated tool", the "model of a business process", "stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system", the "application system", the "interface", "steps of the business process", the "cross functional link", the "supplementary function", the "task scenarios" and the "action scenario" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). *No* new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

Page 3

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: 2.

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for 3. failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recitation therein is unclear, awkward and confusing. The claimed structural element, i.e. the integrated tool, cannot perform the function of process learning aid as claimed. Moreover, it is not understood as to what is the scope of the claimed process learning aid? It is not understood as to what is the meaning of the "stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system defined by an interface, content and scenarios wherein the business process defines the progression of information by the series of roles and tasks"? Further, the references for "an integrated tool", "a model of a business process", "stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system", "an application system", "an interface", "steps of the business process" (as per claims 1-3), "a cross functional link", "a supplementary function" (as per claim 2), "task scenarios" and "an action scenario" (as per claim 3) are unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Worden (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149934 A1). The broadly claimed structure can be interpreted as the computer program connecting the structure of a XML document to its underlying meaning of Worden. Figs. 1-82 of Worden broadly discloses the process learning aid comprising the integrated tool including the model of the business process which having stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system having the interface (see paragraphs 0368-0471), wherein the business process defined the progression of information by the series of roles and tasks to guide the learner through a task to achieve a result (see paragraphs 0236-0269 and 0954-0990), to provide and to explain the option of selecting process function categories or related supplementary function categories, and to demonstrate the action necessary to complete the task though at least one of graphical, audio or textual materials via the interface (see paragraphs0215-0235 and 0271-0334).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Flores et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,837) - note Figs. 1a-8;

Leymann et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,420) - note Figs. 1-12;

Application/Control Number: 09/820,589

Art Unit: 3713

Agrawal et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,038,538) - note Figs. 1-17;

Allen et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,078,918) - note Figs. 1-8;

Leymann et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,237,020 B1) - note Figs. 1-8;

Shigemi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,434 B1) - note Figs. 1-29;

Nagai et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,347,303 B2) - note Figs. 1-26;

Gabbita et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,349,238 B1) - note Figs. 1A-6;

Kim et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0065701 A1) - note Figs. 1-24;

Charisius et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078432 A1) - note Figs. 1-86;

Leymann et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,297 B1) - note Figs. 1-4;

Cramon et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0103660 A1) - note Figs. 1-36;

Shaer (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0128934 A1) - note Figs. 1A-30;

Callahan et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0157023 A1) - note Figs. 1-21;

Leymann et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,507,844 B1) - note Figs. 1-6;

Wydra et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,598,067 B1) - note Figs. 1-12;

Leymann et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,354 B1) - note Figs. 1-4;

Caswell et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,662,355 B1) - note Figs. 1-5;

Gupta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,994 B1) - note Figs. 1-29;

Matichuk (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0027495 A1) - note Figs. 1-8.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joe H. Cheng whose telephone number is (571)272-4433. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri..

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571)272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6e H. Cheng

Primary Examing

Art Unit 3713

Joe H. Cheng March 4, 2005